

FREE AND CANDID
REMARKS

UPON A
SERMON,
PREACHED ON A
PUBLIC OCCASION,

BY THE
Rev. WILLIAM GRAHAM, A.M.

INTITLED,
REPENTANCE the only Condition of
FINAL ACCEPTANCE.

In a LETTER to the AUTHOR.

By GEORGE HAGGERSTON.

Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me. *John v. 39.*

CHRIST in you the Hope of Glory. *Col. i. 27.*

Totus legalis cultus, si non contineat umbras, et figuras quibus respondeat veritas, res erit prorsus lusoria.—Lex (moralis) una est perpetua et inflexibilis vivendi regula. CALVIN.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. BUCKLAND, in Paternoster-Row, and E. and C. DILLY in the Poultry, near the Mansion House.

M D C C L X X I I I .

[Price One Shilling.]

FREE, AND CAN DID
 R. E. M. A. R. K. S.
 UPON A
 S. E. R. M. O. N.
 PREACHED ON A
 PUBLIC OCCASION
 BY THE

Rev. WILLIAM GRAHAM, A. M.
 IN THE
 REPRESENTANCE the only condition of



IN A LETTER
 BY GEORGE HAZARDSON

Such the Scripture; it is then to be
 that they are not which is the
 Christ is for the sake of God.
 For a witness, A new witness, a witness
 of the Spirit is given in the heart
 of the Christian.

L O N D O N:
 Printed for J. Hudson, in Pall-mall, near the Theatre-Francoise.
 M D C C X X I I.
 [Price One Shilling.]

FREE AND CANDID
REMARKS, &c.

REVEREND SIR,

WHOSOEVER is persuaded that the Holy Bible contains a *divine Revelation* may warrantably conclude that one scheme of sentiment is laid down in it, and though it is confessed that no man is infallible, yet I humbly apprehend, that there is a possibility of attaining to some degree of *certainly* concerning the *great and important doctrines* of Religion. If this be not admitted, a divine revelation would appear frivolous, or very little, if at all, advantageous to mankind,

And though we ought to exercise mutual forbearance, with respect to some differences of opinion, relating to matters of little moment, yet when the essential truths of the Gospel are opposed, misrepresented, and ridiculed they who have received the truth as it is in Jesus, may and ought to exert themselves in the vindication of

it, according to the divine injunction, that *we ought to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints (a)*, that is in the holy scriptures; which contain all things necessary to be known, believed, and done, in order to salvation.

The advocates for the true religion have in their several ages appealed to the sacred Oracles, as the sole and infallible standard of faith, worship, and manners. This was done in a spirited and judicious manner, at that remarkable period of time usually called the *Reformation*, by many *eminent* champions, whose names will be *revered* by all *sensible* and *serious* christians, to the latest ages of the world; and since their day the cause of *divine* truth has not wanted advocates, and in our time some in various parts are not backward in maintaining the doctrines of *divine revelation*, against those who depreciate, and revile them. And why may not I add one to the number? I assure you, Sir, that I engage in this work, not out of vanity, or a spirit of cavilling, but from a principle of love to the cause of divine truth. I heard your Sermon with much uneasiness, and I have read it with some attention, and find many things in it which appear to me erroneous, and false. I thought it therefore my duty, as a Preacher of the Gospel, to take some notice of it in this public manner. I esteem you, Sir, as a Scholar, an honest man, and a valuable friend, and

(a) Jude 3.

and am sensible of my inferiority to you in point of general science. Yet as I apprehend you are embarked in the cause of error, I have attempted to point out your mistakes, and to vindicate some of the leading doctrines of the Gospel from your aspersions, and this with a view to prevent, as far as in me lies, common Christians from being seduced by you from the paths of evangelic truth, and, if possible, to rectify your wrong notions of the Christian institution. Allow me then, Sir, to proceed to make some remarks upon several obnoxious passages in your performance; while I strive to guard against wrath and rancour, and to conduct my pen with the spirit of meekness, humility, and love!

In page 6, you appear to me to give a defective account of the end of the *Mosaic constitution*; which so far as I can judge, might be designed to answer these three purposes, namely,

- I. To distinguish the *Israelites* from other nations, by granting unto them various privileges of a religious kind. And possibly this may be intended by you, when you speak of "preserving among them the principles of religion uncorrupted."
- II. To point out the necessity of inward purity: which may probably be meant by you, when you mention "the security of the good morals of that nation." And,

III. To typify the blessings of the GOSPEL, of which you say nothing. *Jesus* said to the Jews, *Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me (a).* Now do not these words intimate, that the constitution by *Moses*, of which we have an account in his writings, was designed to point at the *Messias*? And how can this be, unless we conceive the prescribed rites to be typical of him, and the blessings which he procured?

You say, "that moral virtue is the principal and essential part of the systems both of *Moses* and of *CHRIST*;" that is, "the only thing insisted on as acceptable in the sight of God." I suppose you mean, that *moral virtue* is the ground or foundation of our acceptance with God, which appears to be a great mistake; for this sentiment is neither found in, nor deducible from the system either of *Moses* or of *CHRIST*; for I humbly apprehend that the *Jewish* sacrifices, over which the sins of the people were confessed, were designed to make the people sensible, that they deserved to die for their sins, and that these sacrifices were offered up in their stead; and so might be further intended to point out the future sacrifice of the *Messiah*, in the last age of the world, as the foundation of the acceptance of sincere penitents with God.

(a) John v. 46.

In page 8, you say, "that *Moses* was the Mediator of a *temporary* constitution, but *Jesus* of an eternal one." Well, Sir, this may be admitted, if by a *temporary* constitution, you mean a constitution for a *limited* duration, which was to give way to the *constitution* of the GOSPEL, that was to continue to the end of the WORLD. But I rather think you mean, that there was no ground for the Jews to expect a state of *future* retribution, for you say, that "the *better covenant*, of which *Jesus* was the *Mediator*, was enforced by everlasting sanctions, which the other (that is, the *Hebrew constitution*) was not:" and if so, you appear mistaken; of which more will be noticed in subsequent remarks.

Again, you discover a *wrong notion* of a Mediator, even such as is not suggested by the holy scriptures: it is true you say, "that a Mediator is one between GOD and the PEOPLE." This is admitted. But by the exposition which you give of your own words, it is evident that you only mean, one sustaining the *prophetic character* "in declaring the mind of God, respecting promises and threatenings." No doubt, Sir, *Jesus*, the Mediator of the *better covenant*, was a prophet, yea a *great prophet*, that was to come into the world in the fulness of time, and under that character he has made the *clearest* and *completest* revelation of the will of God, respecting our duty and happiness, but this is not the whole of what

what appears designed by the office of the *Christian Mediator*, who is set forth and represented in scripture, as sustaining the *character* of a *priest*, as well as *that* of a *prophet*; for it is said, that *He was to be a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedec* (a), and He is styled the *High Priest of the Christian profession* (b). Now as the Jewish High Priest entered in once every year, namely, on the great day of atonement, into the *holy of holies*, with the blood of the sacrifices, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people, even so CHRIST, an High Priest of good things to come, by his own blood entered in once into the holy place, that is, into heaven, to appear in the presence of God for us (c). So that we may consider JESUS CHRIST as the *Mediator of redemption and intercession*; and we may warrantably add, that in consideration of his *sacrifice and intercession*, all true believing penitents may look for acceptance with God unto eternal life.

You allow in page 9, “that the religious system of *Moses* was preparatory to something better, and is therefore styled by the Apostle, “a shadow of good things to come.” What you here say in the text of your sermon may be admitted, but the exposition you give in your long note in the margin, contains several things which I cannot approve.

Though

(a) Psalm cx. 4. (b) Heb. iii. 1. (c) Heb. ix. 24.

Though we may not insist, that the whole apparatus of the *Jewish* tabernacle and temple was typical of the Gospel-scheme, yet there appears good reason to conclude, that various services, under the *Mosaic Economy*, were typical of *Christ* and of Gospel- blessings. You assert indeed, "that the Apostle never once intimates, that the one dispensation was a type of the other." Yet the Apostle does expressly say of the tabernacle, *that it was a figure for the time then present*, that is, "the tabernacle, with the services pertaining to it, was a parabolical or imperfect figurative representation of good things then to come, until those things themselves should be more thoroughly explained, and perfectly fulfilled, as they now are under the present Gospel-dispensation (a).

The law, or the constitution by *Moses*, was a shadow of good things to come (b); that is, it was a dark dispensation which had reference to the Gospel institution, that was to be more clear and full. In Coloss. ii. 17. the Apostle speaks of *Jewish* rites as being a shadow of things to come; that is, a dark representation of the blessings of the Gospel; but the body, adds he, is of *Christ*, i. e. the substance, of which the shadow was a representation, is of *CHRIST*, or exhibited by him.

In

(a) Dr. Gaysse.

(b) Heb. x. 1.

In page 10, you express a desire of knowing, "where it is said that the *levitical* sacrifices were intended prefigurations of the Christian scheme, or the death of its founder?" I might refer you to various passages, but I shall only recommend to your attentive re-perusal the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth chapters of the epistle to the *Hebrews*, for your satisfaction in respect of this query.

Nothing of any consequence can be inferred from the ignorance of the Jews, who it is evident, in our Saviour's time, had wrong notions about the *Mosaic* constitution. But the *Jewish* ceremonies, I own, appear to me to have been designed as symbolical representations of the *Messiah*, and the blessings of the *Gospel*. Thus when it is said, *that Christ our passover is sacrificed for us* (a), may we not justly infer, that the *Jewish* passover had some relation to the sacrifice of CHRIST? It is true the passover was an institution designed for the anniversary commemoration of the deliverance of the children of *Israel* from *Egypt*, and the servitude they endured in that country, yet this does not hinder, but that it may also be considered as typical of the death of CHRIST, for does not the Apostle *John* lead our thoughts this way, by the account he gives of CHRIST's death, when he says, *that the soldiers broke not his legs*, as was customary in the case of crucifixion,

and

(a) 1 Cor. v. 7.

and remarks, that by this omission the *scripture* was fulfilled, which said, *A bone of him shall not be broken* (a)? Now the scripture here referred to is in *Exodus* xii. 46. which primarily treats of the paschal lamb. I would here inquire, with what propriety could our sacred historian apply this scripture to the death of CHRIST, if the paschal lamb is not to be considered as a type of his sacrifice? And indeed, as *Calvin* observes, "The whole legal worship will appear to be a trifling business, if it does not contain shadows and figures, to which (evangelic) truth may correspond."

I have thought indeed, that some Christian divines have been too forward, and fanciful in allegorizing the *Jewish* history, yet when the sacred writers intimate that something more was intended, than a bare narrative the matter ought not (methinks) to be treated as ludicrous.

I should, for instance, have considered the story of *Abraham* and his two sons, related in the fifteenth chapter of *Genesis*, as a mere narrative of facts, if the apostle had not said, "that these things are an allegory, signifying the two covenants, namely, by *Moses* and by CHRIST (b)."

The *brazen Serpent*, mentioned in *Numb.* twenty-first, might have passed with me as a meer instituted sign of healing for the benefit of the *Israelites*.

(a) John xix. 33—37. (b) Gal. iv.

Israelites that were bitten by the venomous serpent in the wilderness, if our great Master had not instructed us in *John* iii. 14 and 15, that it had some reference to himself, and the way of our obtaining salvation through faith in him. I cannot forbear to remark, and that with something of surprize and indignation, that I do not see with what decency or propriety, you mention *Alexander* the Great and *Julius Caesar* in this connexion. What your lively fancy may be capable of, I do not pretend to say, or conjecture, but I confess that I am so dull and heavy, that I cannot conceive any possibility of a similarity of circumstances between those butchers of the human species, and the holy Jesus, who came not to destroy men's lives but to save them.

In page 13th. you assert, "that the writers of CHRIST's life unanimously declare, that *repentance* was the subject of *all* his discourses."

This, Sir, is as strange an assertion from the pen of a *Christian divine*, as it is *groundless* and *false*. To what shall I ascribe this *peremptory* declaration? To ignorance? Surely that would be very unkind in me so much as to insinuate, when I am speaking of one, who has so often read over the New Testament. Shall I then impute it to inattention? That would also be unfriendly to the character of a gentleman, who seems to affect appearing as a masterly critic. Well then, with

with honest freedom I scruple not to say that it seems as if this declaration was designed to hide the truth of the case from the view of *common readers*. However, be that as it may, the assertion is certainly false—"that *repentance* was the "subject of *all* CHRIST's discourses; and that "the writers of his life unanimously declare it." It is true he did preach the *doctrine*, and recommend the *duty* of *repentance*, but did he not likewise preach the doctrine of *faith*? Yes certainly. For he told the Jews, *that if they did not believe in him*, namely, as the Messiah, *they should die in their sins* (a). He also preached the Gospel of glad tidings to *sinners* (b); where we find, that he applied a prophecy in *Isaiab lxi. 1, 2, &c.* to himself, as the great Saviour of sinners. And *Matthew xi. 28.* he gave a gracious and encouraging invitation to distressed souls, saying, *Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden; and I will give you rest.*

In his interview with *Nicodemus*, the *Jewish Rabbi*, he spoke concerning the doctrine of regeneration, and taught him that this change in man, so necessary to happiness, must be effected by the influence of the holy Spirit; and in the continuation of his discourse with that great man, he spoke of eternal salvation through faith in himself (c). And he expressed himself publicly to the Jews in this manner: *I am the good shepherd;*

(a) John viii. 24.

(b) Luke iv. 18.

(c) John iii.

shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep (a). And when speaking to his disciples in private, concerning his death and resurrection, he declared, that the Son of Man came to give his life a ransom for many (b).

At the institution of the LORD's supper, He took bread, and gave thanks and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying, *This is my body, which is given for you; likewise also the cup after supper; saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you (c);* or, according to the account given by Matthew, in chapter xxvi. 28. *for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.* Now from what has been said does it not evidently appear, Sir, that you egregiously misrepresent the matter, when you assert, "that the writers of CHRIST's life, unanimously declare that *repentance was the subject of all his discourses?*"

After all, I humbly apprehend, that JESUS CHRIST (for reasons worthy of and becoming his character) did not instruct his Disciples or others fully in the whole scheme of the Gospel. And here I beg leave to recite the words of a late pious, judicious, and eminent Divine (d), who saith, "It is evident that it was not the design of CHRIST in his own life-time, to publish the grace and glory of the Gospel, in so clear, so distinct

(a) John x. 11. (b) Matt. xx. 28. (c) Luke xxii. 19, 20.

(d) Dr. WATTS, in his 35th Sermon.

“ distinct, and so compleat a manner, as he de-
 “ signed to have it published by his Apostles
 “ after he was gone to heaven. The design of
 “ his own public ministry was rather to pre-
 “ pare the way for the setting up his kingdom in
 “ the world, than to set it up in the full glory
 “ of it in his own person. According to this
 “ view of things, his preaching was formed. *Re-*
 “ *pent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,* that
 “ is, the Gospel-state approaches, or hath ap-
 “ proached to you.

“ Even just before his death, his own dis-
 “ ciples themselves could not bear many things
 “ that he had to teach them. These things
 “ therefore were reserved for his communication
 “ with them after his resurrection, when he
 “ spoke to them of things pertaining to the
 “ kingdom of God; and more especially for the
 “ teachings of his own Spirit, which he poured
 “ out upon them after he went to heaven. By
 “ these means they were more compleatly fur-
 “ nished for their ministry, and learnt the doc-
 “ trines of the Gospel in a more perfect manner
 “ than ever our LORD himself taught them in
 “ his life-time.”

“ Thus it appears, that though CHRIST was
 “ the founder of a new religion among men,
 “ yet there is good reason to be given, why he
 “ did not teach plainly and publicly some of the

B

“ chief

“ chief doctrines of this religion, during his
“ own life on earth, namely, because these doc-
“ trines were built on his death, his rising again,
“ and ascending to heaven, which events were
“ then unaccomplished: so that if we would
“ learn the plainest account of the Gospel of
“ CHRIST, it is not enough for us to consult
“ merely his public sermons, or the histories of
“ his life, which are called the four Gospels, but
“ we must read carefully the writings of the
“ Apostles, after he went to heaven.”

In the note, page 14, you say, “ that there
“ is nothing explicitly taught in the law of *Moses*,
“ concerning man’s restoration to a life of con-
“ scioufness, reason, and action, after the present
“ comes to its period.” And pray, Sir, let me
request you to consider, whether any such doc-
trine is taught in the Gospel of CHRIST? You
seem indeed to insinuate “ that this is one of the
“ peculiar doctrines of *christianity*,” though your
expressions seem capable of a *double entendre*.

The doctrine of the resurrection of the body,
appears evidently to be a doctrine of the Gospel,
yet I could never see any reason for our expect-
ing the restoration of consciousness to the soul,
which it never loses.

Many passages might be quoted from the New
Testament, for the confirmation of this point;

I shall

I shall only take notice of two, namely, where the Apostle speaks of Christians, when the earthly tabernacle is dissolved, *as being absent from the body and present with the Lord* (a). And, *Blessed are the Dead which die in the Lord from henceforth* (b). And now from these texts surely it may justly be inferred, that the souls of good men, of true Christians, are in a state of happiness and that immediately after death.

And may not this also be inferred from what is said, *I am the GOD of Abraham, the GOD of Isaac, and the GOD of Jacob* (c)? especially as quoted and explained by our great Master, who added, *GOD is not the GOD of the Dead, but of the Living* (d). So that, according to the remark of a very learned writer (e), “Those good men
 “ must be considered as still in existence; and
 “ therefore it may be concluded, by a strong
 “ train of consequences, that all the faithful live
 “ unto him; for he, on the foot of *Abraham’s*
 “ covenant, owns himself the GOD of all such:
 “ for as all the faithful are the children of
 “ *Abraham*, and the divine promise of being a
 “ God to him and his seed is entailed upon
 “ them, it will prove their continued existence
 “ and happiness in a future state, as much as
 “ *Abraham’s*.”

What has now been said might serve as an answer to what you further urge, namely, “That
 B 2 “ there

(a) 2 Cor. v. 8. (b) Revel. xiv. 13. (c) Exod. iii. 6.

(d) Matt. xxii. 32. (e) Dr. DODDRIDGE in locum.

“ there is not any thing taught concerning the
 “ age prior to *Moses*, whence one can infer a
 “ separate existence of the soul after death.”
 However, I shall further refer to your serious
 consideration, what is said in *Hebrews xi.* where
 we find that mention is made of eminent wor-
 thies, who died in faith, desiring a better coun-
 try, that is, an heavenly : from whence one may,
 without transgressing the rules of logick, or
 just reasoning, infer, that they had expectations of
 happiness for their souls, after the dissolution of
 their bodies. I shall enlarge no further in this
 place, because you have given me occasion to
 say something more about this point, by your
 observation concerning the dispensation, under
 which the *Jews* lived.

As to your insinuation “ concerning our ig-
 “ norance of the *immateriality* of the soul,” I would
 not engage in a *philosophical* discussion of this
 point. This has been done by several eminent
 authors, with whose writings, I doubt not, you
 are well acquainted. I shall only observe, that
 our blessed LORD seems to make a distinction be-
 tween the soul and body, when he says, *Fear not*
them which kill the body, but are not able to kill
the soul; but rather fear him, who is able to de-
stroy both soul and body in hell (a). From these
 words may we not infer, that *man* is not a mere
 piece of *mechanism*, but a creature compounded
 of

(a) Matt. x. 28.

of soul and body, and that the *former* may survive the *dissolution* of the *latter*.

As to the evidence of a future state, on the principles of reason, that not appearing much, if at all, to the point in hand, I pass it over.

Your remark, " that moral purification, or
" real reformation of character, is a qualifica-
" tion absolutely necessary for happiness in a fu-
" ture state, may be admitted ;" yet at the
same time, I see no just reason for making moral
character the ground of acceptance with God.
You assert indeed, " That if there is any mean-
" ing in our SAVIOUR's sermon on the mount,
" moral character, and that only, must recom-
" mend us to the supreme Being." But this
seems an unfair insinuation, and the reason you
assign is not conclusive, namely, " that through-
" out the whole of that sermon, good disposi-
" tions, and a virtuous life, are connected with
" his favour."

It is granted, that holy men are the favourites
of God ; but yet they do not procure, or merit,
his favour by their goodness. Does it not ap-
pear evident, from this *famous sermon* on the
mount, that the *Jewish* Teachers had misinter-
preted the law, as if it only respected outward
actions ? And did they not insinuate, that great
privileges were to be expected, by a descent

from *Abraham*? And that exactness in ceremonies would make amends for defects in morals? Now if these things are attended to, our Saviour's sermon will appear to have much meaning in it; for he has given a just, and spiritual explanation of the law of God, in shewing that it respects the thoughts of the heart, as well as the words of the mouth, and the actions of the life. And thus his discourse seemed directly levelled against the false glosses of the *Jewish Doctors*, and shews the necessity and importance of *inward religion*; but still, when we take only a cursory view of his other speeches and dialogues, and consider the constitution of the Gospel, we cannot rationally think that he ever meant, that *moral character* must procure our acceptance with God.

You say, in page 17, "That those discourses, which have not the improvement of virtuous temper and practice for their object, are absolutely in vain." And you further intimate, "that they rather do hurt." Here, Sir, I commend your zeal for moral character, and agree with you in this matter. And I am really sorry to find, that such kind of discourses as you censure, are delivered by some in the present age; I mean the *teachers* amongst the people called *Moravians*, the *disciples* of Dr. *Crisp*, whether among the *Katapædobaptists*, or *others*; and the followers

followers of *Sandeman*. These kind of preachers fall justly under your censure, and I heartily wish they may no longer deserve the lash of your pen!

But, Sir, from the general strain of your sermon, I think there is reason to conclude, that you level this part of your discourse against the *Calvinistical* divines; and if so, I humbly apprehend, the censure is groundless and unfair; for I have frequently sat under the ministry of such men, as likewise of those in the free-will way, that is in your way, Sir; and I must tell you, that I always found, the preaching of the former generally recommended greater strictness, in respect of piety, personal conduct, and social behaviour, than that of the latter. As to your charge brought against the said *Calvinistical* preachers, "As being afraid to combat vulgar, but destructive prejudices and opinions," it is unjust and unfriendly; for what you call vulgar, destructive, and great errors, they believe and maintain as great and essential Truths.

In page 19, you speak of "the delusion of such guides as have marked out a more compendious way to Heaven than that of repentance."

This is also another groundless insinuation, if designed for the *Calvinists*; for *Calvinistical* divines strenuously maintain the doctrine, and warmly recommend the duty of repentance.

You seem also mistaken in saying, "That the doctrine of the Son of God gave credibility to his miraculous works." For I rather apprehend, that his miraculous works tended, and were designed, to confirm his doctrine; according to a sensible remark of a Jewish Senator: "We know that thou art a teacher come from GOD: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except GOD be with him (a)." The abstract which you have given of our Lord's religion is not just, (as you alledge in page 20.) because unfair and defective.

With what eyes you read the four GOSPELS I do not know, but I find it recorded in them, as spoken by the Son of GOD himself, *that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life (b)*; also that he gave a charge to his disciples, *to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every Creature*, declaring that he *that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but that he that believeth not, shall be damned (c)*. And did not our Lord, in the course of his Ministry, say, *Repent, and believe the Gospel?* and in your text, *Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand?* So that, notwithstanding all you have said about *repentance*, as being the all in all, it would seem that our LORD, by that term, designed something preparative for the reception of the GOSPEL, and
from

(a) John iii. 2. (b) John iii. 16. (c) Mark xvi. 15, 16.

from what has now been quoted, it appears, that even, in what you call the four GOSPELS, faith in the Son of God is connected with final felicity.

As to what you advance, concerning the process of the last judgment, I am ready to own with you, that our acquittal, or condemnation, will depend upon our behaviour or moral deportment; I mean, so far as *that* is evidential of the *sincerity of our religion* and the *truth* of our faith, or *otherwise*. But as our divine Master has taught us, that when we have done all, we are unprofitable servants, and therefore can have no just claim upon God, in consideration of our good morals, after our greatest improvement in religion, we should still look, according to the Apostle, *for eternal life as the gift of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord* (a).

In page 22, you say, "That at the solemn
" time, (namely, of the last judgment) the ho-
" nest and good man will be found to be the
" much preferable character to the sound be-
" liever."

I am really sorry, that you give me so much reason to suggest that you seem to have only an inadequate idea of a *sound faith*; otherwise you must have known, that such a faith is productive of good, of the best works; and therefore sound believers may justly be reckoned honest and
good

(a) Romans vi. 23.

good men. So that you seem to be like some of the ancient Schoolmen, who often made a distinction, where there was no difference !

In page 23, you give a very defective account of the conversation of our LORD with *Nicodemus*. You speak indeed "of moral purity, or right dispositions and conduct; as being required of all who desired admittance into CHRIST's kingdom;" but you say nothing of the way of attaining to this moral purity, though our LORD appears to have spoken, in this very conversation, with precision concerning this point. And here you have either *coined*, or introduced a word, from the atheistical writers, of a disagreeable sound, to express your *contempt* of the *orthodox* divines of the last and present age, namely, "*Mystery-mongers*:" And you say, "that they have unaccountably *inveloped* the subject of *regeneration*." I remember, that Mr. *Charnock* and Mr. *Baxter*, in the last age, and Dr. *Wright* and Dr. *Doddridge*, in the present, have published sermons on that subject; and I would ask you, What is the mystery which they make of it? I have read their writings; and though I will not indeed be accountable for every expression used by all, or any, of them; yet upon the whole, I think that there is good reason to say, they declare the same great and important truth, namely, that regeneration implies a change of nature and life, and that this change is the effect of a divine energy

energy on the soul. Whether you referred to the writings of these eminent men, I cannot tell, but as they appear to me to have handled this subject in a judicious and scriptural manner, I thought it might not be improper to mention them; and I make no doubt but their names will be honoured, while there is a relish for serious religion in the world. Permit me, Sir, to ask you, do not you find something similar to the doctrine of those great divines, even in the writings of the ancient Heathens as *Cicero*, *Nemo vir magnus, sine afflatu divino* (a): and *Seneca*; *Miraris hominem ad Deos ire? Deus ad homines venit; imo quod propius est in homines venit: nulla sine Deo mens bona est*: that is, "Dost thou wonder that a man should go to the Gods? God hath come to men, yea which is nigher still, hath come into men: there is no good mind without God.

I go on to take some notice, Sir, of your account of the conversation of our LORD, with the woman of *Samaria*. You say, "that it was more private than that with *Nicodemus*." This I rather question; for it is certain that the place and time were more public, being at a common town-well at mid-day. However, in your account of our LORD's conversation with the woman of *Samaria*, you say, "that under the metaphor of water, and its aptness to quench thirst, he recommended religious character, &c." Our LORD,

(a) There is no great man without a divine afflatus.

LORD, in his interview with this woman, spoke of his giving living water, and added, that whosoever should drink of the water that he should give, should never thirst; but that the water, that he would give, should be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life.

Now by this water here, may we not understand the holy Spirit, that was promised under this emblem? And is not this sense confirmed by what our LORD is brought in as saying in another place? namely, *If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink: he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.* But this, says the Evangelist, *spake he of the Spirit, which they, that believe on him, should receive* (a): whose influences are as refreshing to gracious souls, as water is to bodily thirst, and by whose agency those who believe on the Son of God, are prepared for that endless life, which he hath brought to light in the GOSPEL. I shall pass over what you remark concerning *John the Baptist*, as I shall have a fitter opportunity of taking notice of it in the sequel; and proceed to consider what you say concerning our LORD's immediate followers.

As to the Apostle *Paul's* discourse at *Athens*, it was doubtless truly admirable, and well adapted to the purpose for which it was delivered, and
your

(a) John vii. 37, 38, 39.

your account of it allowed to be pretty just. But it cannot reasonably be thought that he had time, or opportunity of laying before them the whole of the Christian - scheme ; for when he mentioned the future judgment, and the resurrection of the dead, in order to it, some of the Philosophers (probably the *Epicureans*) derided him ; upon which he broke off his discourse : therefore, Sir, little can be inferred from his speech, in support of your grand point ; and as little can be inferred from his discourse before *Felix*, for though he begun to speak “ concerning the faith of CHRIST”, or christianity ; yet it is plain he was interrupted, and ordered to desist and withdraw.

And even when the Apostle, as in his celebrated Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, declared the doctrines of the GOSPEL, in the fullest manner, he always guarded against the abuse of them, and made it evident, that the Christian faith “ did not soothe the follies and vices of men : nor relax social, moral, and religious obligations ; but, on the contrary, carried virtue to the highest pitch.” So that I entirely agree with you here, page 28, “ that the Apostle does by no means contradict himself, much less weaken the obligations of religion and virtue.”

It seems, however, that some objected against his doctrine as encouraging licentiousness, but,

as you truly say, "they were such as did not understand *Paul's* principles." The same objection, Sir, is brought against modern preachers, who strenuously maintain the doctrine of free grace. And is not this a strong presumption, that their doctrine is similar to what *Paul* preached? If he had taught nothing but moral virtue, and that as a *sufficient* and the *only recommendation* to God, let me ask you, good Sir, what pretence there could have been for any to say, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound (a)?" In the history of the Apostles, we find, that he preached the doctrine of faith as well as that of repentance: for thus he says of himself, *that he testified both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance towards God, and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ (b)*. And when he was imprisoned at *Philippi*, the Jailer put an important question to *Paul* and *Silas*, saying, "Sirs, What must I do to be saved?" And their answer was, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved (c)*.

I proceed now, Sir, to take some notice of what you say concerning *Paul's* Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*; in which you allow is contained an account "of the Gospel-method of justification." But one may be justly surprised, that you overlook what the Apostle so often

(a) Romans vi. 1. (b) Acts xx. 21.

(c) Chap. xvi. 30, 31.

often repeats in these important and instructive epistles, namely, "That justification is by faith, without the works of the Law." This omission appears unfair; and might probably be owing to an apprehension, that such a remark would not suit your purpose, as not tallying with the leading doctrine of your discourse. However, you seem, as with a *masterly hand*, and with *precision*, to point out "the method of justification, according to the GOSPEL: which, you say grants pardon to penitent offenders for *ever*, in opposition to the law given by *Moses*, which, though it might justify a *Jew politically*, could not justify him *eternally*; for the dispensation under which the Jews lived, made no provision for penitent characters *beyond the grave*."

Here I am sorry you give me occasion to say, that you discover your ignorance of the law, or of the *constitution* by *Moses*. I grant that the *Jews* were under a *theocracy*, and that *Yehovah* may be considered as their political head, or their governor; but yet, as was shewed before, the *Mosaic* institution had some respect to *CHRIST*, and the blessings of the GOSPEL. If I understand you at all in this place, you do and must mean, that the doctrine of a future state was no article of the *Jewish creed*; or that all the happiness which the *Jews* expected, or had warrant to expect from, and by their religious institutions

and observances, was confined within the boundaries of this temporary life. So, that neither *Moses*, nor the prophets, taught any thing about a future existence. According to this representation, there are no hints concerning a future state in any part of the Old Testament : and no wonder then that *John the Baptist*, though said to be greater than all that were before him, was ignorant of this part ; so that, as you say, in a note, page 25, “ he gave no intimations of eternal life. But whatever is contained in the Old Testament, or was taught by the *Baptist*, it is evident that the *Pharisees*, (the most leading sect among the *Jews*) maintained and expected a future existence : or the separate existence of souls, and the resurrection of the dead. Vide *Josephum de bello Judaico*, Lib. 2. cap. 12. And the sacred Historian *Luke* tells us, in *Acts* xxiii. 8. *That the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, neither of Angel nor Spirit, but that the Pharisees confess both ; i. e. the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, the existence of invisible beings, usually called Angels, and the existence of human spirits in a state of consciousness, after the dissolution of the body ; but not so the Pharisees.*

Is it not then manifest, that the *Pharisaic Jews* looked for a future life ? And indeed the dispensation under which the *Jews* lived ; i. e. the Old Testament, might give them reason to expect it. We read concerning *Enoch*, an Antediluvian,

luvian, *that he walked with GOD*, and that he was not, for *GOD took him (a)*, which words are well expounded by the Apostle to the *Hebrews*, chap. xi. 5. *By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see death; and was not found upon earth, because GOD had translated him; i. e. into the invisible world: a change being made upon his body, similar to what shall be the case in respect of the bodies of the saints, who shall be found alive at the sound of the last trumpet, concerning whom the Apostle Paul says, in 1 Cor. xv. 52. that they shall be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible; and we who are alive shall be changed, namely, in such a manner as to be fitted for an immortal duration. Now may we not reasonably think that the translation of Enoch, and afterwards that of Elijah might be designed as a proof to their respective generations, and to all who shall read the narrative of these amazing facts, of the truth of a future state of felicity for the saints? And though temporal blessings are chiefly promised under the Old Testament, and particularly in the constitution by Moses, yet we find that when CHRIST was engaged in a dispute with the Sadducees, who, (it is said by several learned authors) owned only the authority of the Pentateuch, he quoted a passage from Exodus against their erroneous notions concerning the resurrection;*

LUUO I

C

tion;

(a) Gen. v. 24.

tion: *Ye do err*, says he, *not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of GOD (b)*. Now by the scriptures here he means some part of the Old Testament, and particularly the writings of *Moses*; and he ascribes the mistake of the *Sadducees*, to their ignorance of the true meaning of these ancient writings and of the power of God.

Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, which intimate that there shall be a resurrection of the dead; nor the power of GOD, who is able to bring about so great an event. The scripture our Lord refers to is found in *Exodus* iii. 6. where *Jehovah* is brought in, saying: *I am the GOD of Abraham, and the GOD of Isaac, and the GOD of Jacob*; and our Lord subjoined, *GOD is not the GOD of the Dead, but of the Living*. Upon which words a judicious and solid Divine (c) has the following remark: "As the chief prejudice of the *Sadducees* against the resurrection lay in their disbelief of the immortality of the soul, or of any future state whatsoever, the argument, taken from God's being the God of the living only, was a clear and effectual confutation of their error."

May we not then reasonably conclude, upon the authority of our SAVIOUR's reasoning, that the doctrine of a future state, or of the happiness of good men after death, is contained in the writings of *Moses*?

I could

(b) Matt. xxii. 29.

(c) Dr. Guyse.

I could not well avoid, Sir, taking notice of this famous text a second time; and, I hope, that as the various passages in your Sermon rendered the repetition necessary, it will not be accounted tedious.

I might here observe, that the scriptural notion of death seems to be this:—*that the soul leaves the body.* Paul spoke of his own death in this manner, “having a desire to *depart* (d);” and, “the time of my *departure* is at hand (e).” In this manner the death of *Rachel* is described: *And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, for she died* (f). And accordingly, in the instances of such as were raised from the dead, their souls may be conceived of as returning to their bodies, as in the case of the widow’s son at *Zarephath*, mentioned in the first book of *Kings*, chap. xviii. 21, 22; where we read, *that Elijah stretched himself upon the child three times, and cried unto the Lord, and said, O Lord my GOD, I pray thee, let this child’s soul come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived.*

Now may it not be justly inferred from these passages, that the soul survives the dissolution of the body, or exists in a state of separation from it?

C 2

I shall

(d) Phil. i. 23. (e) 2 Tim. iv. 6. (f) Gen. xxxv. 18.

I shall produce a few more texts in confirmation of this point: *The wicked is driven away in his wickedness; but the righteous hath hope in his death* (g). Hope of what? no doubt the sacred writer means the hope of future existence and happiness. I appeal to common sense if this is not the obvious meaning. In *Ecclesiastes* xii. 7. it is told us: *Then shall the dust, (that is, the body) return to dust, from whence it derived its original; and the spirit shall return unto GOD who gave it; namely, to receive that sentence, which shall determine its state for ever.* In *Isaiab* lvii. 2. the Prophet, speaking of the righteous perishing, or dying out of this world, says, *he shall enter into peace*: this respects the state of the soul, which shall be happy: *they shall rest in their beds, that is, their bodies shall rest in their graves; each one walking, or having walked, in uprightness.* In which sentence is pointed out the character and conduct of those, who shall be happy immediately after death. We are told also, *Dan* xii. 2, *that many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.* Is not this a full and glorious testimony to the doctrine of the general resurrection?

I might subjoin one passage more, and that even from the New Testament, in confirmation of the point in hand, found in the parable of the rich

man

rich

(g) Prov. xiv. 32.

rich man and *Lazarus* (i), where it is said, *that the rich man, being in bades and tormented, begged of Abraham a small favor by the hands of Lazarus*; and that being refused, he presented a petition in behalf of his brethren, yet living in this world, that *Lazarus* might be sent to assure them that there was a place of torment for the wicked after death; that by such extraordinary intelligence and warning they might be induced to repent, and so escape it. *Abraham* replied, *They have, Moses and the Prophets*; let them bear them. The rich man renewed and urged his petition in favour of his brethren; and *Abraham* answered, *If they bear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded*, namely, of the truth of a future state, and to repent of their sins, *though one rose from the dead.*

Now though this be only a parable, yet two things seem fairly deducible from it, namely,

1. That the souls of the righteous are happy, and that the souls of the wicked are miserable immediately after death. And,

2. That the doctrine of a future state of retribution is contained in the writings of *Moses* and the Prophets.

And this appears to have been generally believed among the *Jews*, the *Sadducees* excepted;

for though the account given by *Josephus* of the opinions of the *Pharisees* should be admitted as true; namely, that the wicked would be doomed to everlasting misery, without a resurrection, and that by the resurrection of the righteous was only meant a *transmigration*, yet even upon that hypothesis it is manifest that the *Pharisees* never dreamt of the sleep, unconsciousness, or annihilation of the soul; but maintained, that men would be punished or rewarded according to their behaviour in this life; though, it seems, they mistook the doctrine contained in the Law and the Prophets concerning a future state: as many, who profess to believe Christianity, mistake the doctrines of that divine institution.

From what has been said, may I not warrantably conclude, that you yourself, Sir, are egregiously mistaken, in asserting, “ that the dispensation, under which the *Jews* lived, made no provision for penitent characters beyond the grave?” page 29.

I would here take some further notice of what you insinuate concerning the *Baptist*, page 25, namely, “ that he declared that, with regard to penitent characters the penal consequence should not take place, but gave no intimations of eternal life.” We find that this same person was prophesied of by *Isaiab* and *Malachi*, as

one that should be employed in an honourable and important office, namely, in preparing the way for the *reception* of the *Messiah*; whose *bar-binger* he was. And we read that, *when he saw many of the Pharisees, and Sadducees come to his baptism* (k), he seemed to be surprized; probably reflecting upon the principles of those sects; that the former made pretensions to uncommon *sanctity*, which they might think would be sufficient to screen them from all danger of misery; and that the latter disbelieved a future state, and of consequence looked upon religion as being only a mere pretence, and therefore the *Baptist* cried out, *Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?* Now does not this question imply, that this holy man said something in his preaching concerning deliverance from future misery? And may it not be added also, that he solemnly cautioned them against depending on their descent from *Abraham*, and recommended sincerity in religion?

In *Luke* iii. it is said, *that he preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins*. Now remission of sins is certainly a spiritual blessing; and, it is said, that in consequence of *John's* preaching, all flesh, that is, *Gentiles* as well as *Jews*, should see the *salvation* of God (l). And this salvation ought not to be restrained to any privilege enjoyed in this world, but may *rationaly*

c 4

be

(k) *Matt.* iii.(l) *Luke* iii. 6.

be supposed to signify spiritual and eternal salvation.

In *John* i. 29. we read, *that when John saw Jesus coming towards him, he said, Behold the Lamb of GOD, which taketh away the sin of the world!* Now taking away sin seems evidently to imply deliverance from the guilt, power, and condemnation of it; and in consequence thereof may not immortal happiness reasonably be expected? *He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life (m).* From what we read then concerning the preaching and speeches of the *Baptist*, it should seem that he might and did give intimations of eternal life.

You allow, page 29, that, "according to the Gospel-method of justification laid down in the Epistles to the *Romans* and *Galatians*, pardon is granted to penitent characters for ever: and insist, that the Jews could only expect a political justification under the *Mosaic economy*."

But may not this last position be refuted by *St. Paul's* reasoning in *Romans* x. where it is said, that he expressed a hearty desire for the *Jews*, that they might be saved! that is, eternally, no doubt: for he remarks, *that they were ignorant of GOD's righteousness, and went about to establish their own righteousness.* Now whether this, their own righteousness, consisted in moral, devotional,

(m) *John* iii. 36.

votional, or ceremonial performances, or all these taken together, it appears pretty evident that they thought it was such a righteousness as would intitle them to eternal life. In *Acts* xv. 1. we are told, *that some went down from Judea to Antioch, and taught that circumcision, after the manner of Moses, was necessary to salvation.* These persons seem to have been some of the sect of the *Pharisees*, who insisted that proselytes from Heathenism should be circumcised, and thereby be laid under obligation to keep the law of *Moses*. Now here we may observe, that *Paul* sometimes treated circumcision as a thing indifferent in itself, but that when any attempt was made to impose it on the *Gentile-believers*, he opposed it vigorously, particularly in his Epistle to the *Galatians*, wherein he declared, that whosoever submitted to circumcision, namely, under the notion of its necessity to salvation, should receive no benefit by *CHRIST*, and that those who are justified by the Law, that is, who sought justification by the Law, are fallen from grace, that is, from the gracious scheme of the *GOSPEL*, that teaches the doctrine of justification by faith, without the works of the Law. Is it not plain then, that the judaizing Christians looked for justification, not merely politically, but eternally? And that not so much through their faith in *CHRIST*, as on the account of the legal observances? And as I have shewed that, the doctrine

of

of a future state was an article of the Jewish creed, even the *Jews*, who did not believe Christianity, might also expect justification, not a *political* but *eternal* justification, by their strict observance of the *Mosaic ritual* as legal, not understanding the divine *intendment* of that *constitution*, which was on the whole a constitution of grace, and is represented by *Paul* as a *School-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith* (n).

I cheerfully assent to what you say, "That none ever urged the observance of moral or good works, with greater warmth than *Paul* does in the fore-cited Epistles. And that it is not to be supposed he would recommend a faith that could not produce them."—Verily not, Sir; for the faith he recommends was a faith of the operation of God, which purifies the heart, works by love, and is the principle of new and holy obedience. And if faith produces not such effects and fruits, it is not a justifying, a saving, nor a *sound* faith. There, Sir, we agree.

I proceed to consider what you say, page 30, concerning the doctrine of *Peter*. It was the will of CHRIST, *that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem* (o). Accordingly
Peter

(n) Gal. iii. 25. (o) Luke xxiv. 46.

Peter and others preached repentance, but does it follow that he, and they, preached nothing else? And though this venerable man said to the *Jews*, *Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out* (p), yet he no where declares, as you assert, "that repentance was the condition of God's final favour, and of our acceptance." On the contrary, we find, that he preached salvation in the name of *JESUS* before the *Jewish Sanhedrim*. *Neither is there salvation in any other, &c* (q). What he says cannot (methinks) reasonably be confined to the case of miraculous cures, but ought to be understood of spiritual and eternal salvation, for the *Jewish Council*, and people of *Israel* did not all need bodily cures, but, as sinners, they all stood in need of salvation.

In *Acts*, chap. x. we find, that *Peter*, when in the house of *Cornelius*, a Roman Centurion, spoke concerning the Word, which God sent unto the children of *Israel*, preaching peace by *JESUS CHRIST*, spoke of his death and resurrection, (that was sufficiently attested) and of his being appointed of God to be the Judge of the World. And added, verse 43, *To him gave all the Prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins*. And in his first Epistle, ch. i. 18, 19, he speaks of redemption by the precious blood of *Christ*. If it should

(p) *Acts* iii. 19.(q) *Acts* iv. 12.

should be suggested, that he there only mentions redemption from a vain conversation, be it so: yet this may satisfy us that redemption and holiness are not incompatible, but rather, that the latter is consequential of the former, for JESUS saves his people, not in, but from, their sins (r). From what has been said does it not appear that *Peter* taught something besides repentance? namely, Salvation through Faith in JESUS CHRIST. And you yourself allow, that “both *Paul* and “*Peter* descanted very copiously on the love of “GOD in CHRIST.” And I know no sensible person, who understands the Gospel-scheme, that will deny, or in the least call in question what you add, namely, “that both assert, that no sins “shall be forgiven, that are not repented of “and forsaken.” For the most strenuous and judicious advocates for the doctrine of free grace, and for redemption through the blood of CHRIST, recommend repentance as being essential to true religion, and as absolutely necessary to final happiness. They also approve of what you say, page 31, “That the Christian dispensation is a “plan, a gracious plan, established for the benefit of penitent characters only.” For none of them ever suggested, that impenitent sinners (remaining such) should be made partakers of the final blessings of the GOSPEL.

I find nothing like such a notion in the writings of the celebrated *Calvin*. Let his own words bear witness for him.

“Non

(r) Matt. i. 21.

“Non abs re summa evangelii statuitur in
 “poenitentia & remissione peccatorum(s);” that
 is, *It is not foreign to the purpose to remark that
 the sum of the Gospel consists in repentance and re-
 mission of sins.* The same just sentiment is adopted
 by all his consistent followers.

As to *Revelation xxii. 14*, which pronounces
those blessed, who do the commandments of GOD,
as having a right to the tree of life, I apprehend
 that you quote this text with an air of
triumph, as a strong and full corroboration of your
*leading point, namely, “that the right to eter-
 nal life is founded on personal obedience.”*

But, Sir, you cannot but know, that the word
 translated *RIGHT*, here, is *εξουσια*, and may and
 does signify privilege, and is so rendered by
 Dr. Doddridge and others, in *John i. 12*. And
 so I would understand the word in this place,
 which holds forth that the privilege of partaking
 of the tree of life is a free grant to believers in
 CHRIST whose faith is evidenced to be true
 by their sincere obedience to the divine com-
 mandments.

You justly observe, page 32, “that religious
 “disputes are generally conducted with much
 “animosity, and with little attention to good
 “manners and Christian charity.” And of this,

Sir,

(s) Institut. Lib. iii. cap. 3. Sect. 1.

Sir, have you not given a *sample* in your bitter declamations against the advocates for the scheme of *Evangelic Truth*?

As to preaching CHRIST, it must doubtless mean preaching the whole of Christianity, the ruin and recovery of sinful Man, or that scheme of faith and duty delivered by CHRIST, and by his Apostles, under the direction and guidance of the holy Spirit, and it must mean preaching concerning the person and offices of CHRIST, and the blessings of his redemption. And for my own part I must acknowledge, that I am so ignorant, that I never as yet knew "any modern" preachers of CHRIST that ever denounced "anathemas against those who controverted their" authority."

I hardly know what you mean here, for really your language seems to be "equally void of sense and temper." Pray, Sir, what authority do any of the orthodox preachers lay claim to? I have no idea of any authority, but *that* of declaring, upon scriptural evidence, the important truths and duties of religion; and do not you think yourself sufficiently authorised and qualified for such an undertaking? Indeed a great many preachers may possibly, with deep concern of mind, have spoken of the *anathema* denounced by the Apostle *Paul* against those, (whether men or angels) who taught a doctrine
contrary

contrary to that which he delivered to the *Galatians*: and who were the men whom the Apostle referred to, when he wrote these words, in *Galatians* i. 9? Were they not the judaizing Teachers, who were for joining *Moses* and *CHRIST*, or the Law and GOSPEL together? And in general were they not such as denied the doctrine of Justification by faith in *CHRIST*, without the works of the Law? which appears to be the leading doctrine of that weighty and instructive Epistle, and is clearly stated, and fully established and confirmed by it. And, Sir, I heartily wish that you, and all of your cast of sentiments, would seriously consider, who they are, in our day, that seem to be in the greatest *danger* of falling under that *dreadful, very dreadful, apostolic anathema*!

I agree with what you say, in page 34, "that wrath and rancour are no virtues." But I cannot so readily assent to what you add, "that the want of charity is as surely want of Christianity," till I know what you intend by *charity*.

If by charity is meant love, that is, love to God and Man, I am very willing to allow that "want of charity is want of Christianity."

But if by *charity* you mean (as I suppose) a favourable opinion of those who differ from us

in

in respect of religious principles, I would here readily acknowledge, that there may be different sentiments concerning some religious opinions, and that, notwithstanding those differences, men, on both sides of a controverted point, may be persons of real religion, and in a safe state towards God; and while their differences, whether respecting doctrine, worship, or discipline, or all these taken together, do not affect the vitals of Christianity, they ought to bear with one another; or, if you please, have charity for one another; that is, so as to think that both parties may be in a safe and happy state.

But if persons maintain such opinions as appear to me subversive of the main scheme of the GOSPEL, I do not see that I, as a Christian, or an honest man, *can*, nor indeed *ought* to have charity for them in this sense; since, according to my apprehensions, they appear to me to be in an *erroneous* and *unsafe* way, and, methinks, I should rather shew them my charity or love by endeavouring, in the spirit of meekness, to convince them of their mistakes, and, if possible, direct them into the way of *truth* and *salvation*. Surely I cannot *rationaly* be charged with the *want* of charity, for declaring their tenets to be erroneous, or contrary to the Gospel-constitution, when I really believe them to be so; otherwise *Paul* must be looked upon a most *uncharitable* bigot

bigot, for the anathema levelled against those, who taught any doctrine as *necessary* to salvation, which was *contrary* to that scheme of sentiment which he recommended as *evangelic*.

Your encomium on the Christian spirit is admitted to be *pretty just*, but appears *ill pointed*. The advocates for free grace inculcate “the necessity of universal virtue, and its importance to everlasting self-enjoyment:” therefore according to your own representation of the case, (page 35) they are preachers of CHRIST. In opposition to what you alledge, (page 36.) I would, on the authority of the New Testament, *announce*, that CHRIST is “at once the foundation, the end, and the glory of the Christian scheme.” “For other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is JESUS CHRIST, who is the way, the truth, and the life, and in Christians the hope of glory.”

In page 37, you insinuate, “that some preach CHRIST in such a way as to supersede the exercise and necessity of moral virtue.”

This is a repeated *calumny*, a *false*, and *groundless charge*, that hath already been refuted, if you design it for the persons that I suppose you have in your eye.

You say, “that some preach CHRIST by declaring with *oracular* authority, that penitence,

D

“ or

“ or personal obedience will do nothing for them in the final issue of things.” If you intend that they assert that *penitence* will not be the *ground* or *foundation* of their *acquittal*, or *acceptance* unto life, I do declare, with *oracular authority*, that is, by the authority of the *sacred oracles* contained in the *Bible*, that it may justly be admitted as a truth, for that book instructs us to seek acceptance only in *CHRIST* the Beloved, and that in consideration of his righteousness, and not our own, we are to look for deliverance from the wrath to come. However, at the same time, I still urge (and, I trust, consistently with the foregoing declaration) that *personal righteousness* is *absolutely necessary* as a proper qualification for the celestial happiness.

In note, page 37, you say, “ You cannot find that *CHRIST* is styled the Sinner’s surety any where in the New Testament.” We find, that in *Hebrews* viii. 6. he is styled the Mediator of a better Testament, and we are sure that he is our Mediator, or a Mediator between God and us. When therefore he is called the *Surety* of a better Testament, may it not be reasonably thought that he is a Surety for us? And verily he is such a Surety as suffered for us, that is, on the account of our sins, for, according to the doctrine of the Apostle *Peter*, he bore our sins, in his own body, on the tree (a), and that (as we humbly apprehend) “ in consequence of a solemn stipulation

(a) 2 Pet. ii. 24.

"lation with the Father before all worlds." You inquire where is this transaction recorded? I might reply in various parts of every Bible that I have seen. I shall only mention a few texts, where something very like it may be found, namely, *Psalms* lxxxix. 3, 34—37. *Isaiah* xlii. 6. chap. xlix. 8; and chap. liji. 10—12, &c, &c.

You ask, (page 38.) "Whether CHRIST himself did ever preach any such doctrine, namely, of deliverance from wrath through him?" Yes, Sir, something very like it, as when he spoke of himself as the SON OF MAN, who came to seek and to save that which was lost; and when he instructed *Nicodemus* in the doctrine of salvation through *his death* by *faith*, and when he spoke of his *blood* being shed for the *remission* of the sins of many. And therefore we have sufficient authority to preach such kind of doctrine, which is in fact true and evangelic, and is consistent with the design of CHRIST in coming into the world to destroy the kingdom of Satan, for, it is said, *that through his death he destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil* (b).

You say, that "We have a divine authority to believe, that repentance blots out sin." I call upon you to shew in what part of the Bible that authority is found. Perhaps you may refer

D 2

me

(b) Heb. ii. 14.

me to *Acts* iii. 19. *Repent, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out.* — But these words only imply that the sins of sincere penitents shall be blotted out, but not that sins are blotted out by penitence, on the contrary, we have authority to believe that our sins are blotted out through the blood of CHRIST. *In him we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins (c)*; which redemption seems to be pretty much of the same import with imputed righteousness.

In the note, page 39, you intimate as if you thought that you have discovered the date of the doctrine of imputed righteousness, and seem to father it upon *Peter Lombard* in the twelfth century. But though I know very little of the writings of that author, or of the writings of the FATHERS, yet, I humbly apprehend, that your conjecture is not well founded, for it is clear to me, that this important doctrine of *imputed righteousness* may be traced up to the Apostolic age, and even to the first ages of the world.

The Apostle *Paul*, in *Romans* iv. speaks of the blessedness of the man unto whom God *imputeth righteousness, without works*: and in chap. x. he says, that CHRIST is the end of the Law for *righteousness* to every one that *believeth*: see also 2 *Cor.* v. 21. and *Philippians* iii. 9. Yea, something of this doctrine seems to be found in the writings

(c) *Ephes.* i. 7.

writings of *Isaiab*, as in chap. xlv. 24, 25. Surely, shall one say, in the LORD have I *righteousness* and *strength*: even to him shall men come. In the LORD shall all the seed of *Israel* be justified, and shall glory. For the application of this passage to CHRIST we have the authority of the Apostle *Paul*, Rom. xiv. 10, 11. where he says, *that we shall all stand before the judgement-seat of Christ; for it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to GOD.*

Now the writing here quoted, is found in the twenty-third verse of the fore-cited chapter of *Isaiab*, which runs thus: *I have sworn by myself, the word is gone out of my mouth in righteousness, and shall not return; that unto me every knee shall bow, every tongue shall swear.* Add further that in *Isaiab* liii. 5, and following verse, it is said, CHRIST was wounded for our transgressions, and that he was bruised for our iniquities; that the LORD hath laid on him the iniquity of us all; and that for the transgression of my people was he stricken; and that he bare the sin of many.

The celebrated text in *Jeremiah* xxiii. 6. is justly applicable to the point in hand, as being descriptive of the MESSIAH. This is his name, whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. I know that it may be urged, that in chap. xxxiii. *Jerusalem* is styled, *The Lord*

our Righteousness; but then it is worthy of notice, that the *Hebrew* text may be thus rendered, and he who shall call her (is) The LORD our Righteousness (d). According to this literal and true version, *Jerusalem* is not called *The LORD our Righteousness*, but the Prophet instructs us, that *he*, who should call *Jerusalem* to Salvation, shall be *The LORD our Righteousness*, as being the foundation of the faith, and hope of the church.

Further, something like this doctrine may be discovered in the age of *Abraham*. The Scripture, says the Apostle, *foreseeing that GOD would justify the Heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, namely, In thee shall all nations be blessed* (e); referring to what is said in the twelfth and twenty-second chapters of *Genesis*. And in *Romans* iv. the Apostle shews that *Abraham* was justified by faith, and seems to make the way of *Abraham's* justification the model of the justification of believers in every age, for though it be said once and again, that faith was imputed to him for righteousness, yet this may be understood, not of the *act* of faith, but of the *object* of faith, for the Apostle says, that it was not written for his sake alone that it was *imputed* to him, but for us also, to whom it shall be *imputed*, if we believe on him that raised up *JESUS* our LORD, from the dead.

(d) See MONTANUS's *Heb. Bible*.

(e) *Galatians* iii. 8.

dead. Now surely it cannot possibly be *Abraham's faith*, but the *righteousness* received by *faith*, that shall be *imputed* for the justification of believers in every age. And I beg leave to transcribe a remark made on this verse, by a judicious and solid critic (f):

“ This application or improvement of what
 “ had been said about *Abraham's* justification,
 “ makes it evident to me that his faith for this
 “ purpose not only rested on the power of God,
 “ for performing his promise, but likewise look-
 “ ed forward to the promised MESSIAH, and to
 “ what was to be done by him for the justifica-
 “ tion of *Abraham*; and of all that should be-
 “ lieve in CHRIST: otherwise I cannot see how
 “ this could be an instance and sample of God's
 “ way of justifying those that should believe un-
 “ der the Gospel-state, or how there could be
 “ an analogy between *Abraham's* faith and theirs,
 “ with relation to that grand point, which is
 “ manifestly supposed in the Apostle's method
 “ of reasoning about it.”

In short, it has been thought, by many *eminent* and *judicious Divines*, that something like this doctrine may be traced even to the days of *Adam*. Though the LORD turned him out of Paradise, yet he made some discovery of his grace by the promise concerning the *seed* of the woman that

D 4

should

(f) Dr. Goyse,

should bruise the head of the serpent (g). And we read that *the Lord GOD made for Adam and his wife coats of skins, and clothed them* (b). Now as it does not appear that there was any grant of animal food to man, till after the flood, we may, with the pious commentator (i), whose praise is in the churches, and ever will be, while there is a relish for serious religion in the world probably suppose, "That these skins, with which
 " our first parents were clothed, were the skins
 " of beasts offered in sacrifice by divine appoint-
 " ment; and that as types of the sacrifice of
 " the MESSIAH, in the fulness of time, who is
 " therefore said to be the Lamb slain from the
 " foundation of the world: and the skins that
 " covered their shame, might typify the right-
 " teousness of CHRIST."

From what has been said, it appears, Sir, that you are much mistaken in what you alledge concerning this point. And seeing this doctrine of *imputed righteousness*, or *justification* and *acceptance* with God, through the *merits of Christ* appears to be so essential a part of the *Gospel-scheme*, you, Sir, are justly deserving of *severe censure*, for styling it "*licentious, horrid, and blasphemous.*"

In page 40, you speak of prayer in a very slight manner, as if it only meant "muttering a few
 " sentences (and often incoherent ones) to God
 " Almighty,

(g) Gen. iii. 15. (b) Gen. iii. 21.

(i) MR. MATTHEW HENRY.

"Almighty, with hands and eyes uplifted." But you take no notice of the engagement of the heart in the service, without which the most correct form of words, pronounced with the greatest *propriety*, and in the most *decent attitude*, might justly be looked upon as mere *babbling*, for the LORD says, My son, give me thy heart. And verily, "a man might justly be deemed "foolish and mad, who trusted his *acceptance* and "salvation to such kind of praying," for the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the LORD.

Prayer, in the comprehensive sense of the word, denotes not only *petition*, but an *address* to God, including a variety of cases. And it appears to be a *rational* service, as well as a *duty* required by our *holy religion*. Reason, as well as the Bible, may instruct us, that we ought to do homage to the great Author of our beings, and the giver of all our mercies, and that of him we should seek all those blessings, which are necessary to our happiness. And when prayer is performed in a serious manner, and in the exercise of suitable graces and affections, we may, with good reason, conclude that the service shall not be useless, for the LORD has said, *Call upon me, and I will answer thee.* And CHRIST has given us reason to hope for some benefit by means of prayer, from his promises, saying, *Ask, and it shall*

be given you; seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened unto you; and the Apostle James says, that the effectual fervent, or the in-wrought, prayer of a righteous man, availeth much.

So that if any should inquire, what profit is to be expected by prayer? May we not answer with the Apostle in another case, *Much every way?* For prayer may induce us to love God, the Author of our beings, and fountain of all our blessings, and engage us to be grateful to him, for favours already received, and to commend ourselves to his care and protection, to *trust* in him, under all the vicissitudes, changes, and trials of life; and *hope* in his mercy; through Jesus CHRIST for every blessing necessary for us.

Further, by means of prayer, our love to men may be promoted and cherished. When we are engaged in prayer with and for others, do not we sometimes feel our very hearts become well affected to them? especially when we can and do consider them, as children of the same Father, members of the same mystical body, and heirs of the same promises? Thus prayer, *sincerely* performed, may answer some valuable ends, in promoting and improving the Divine and Christian temper. Yet still, Sir, we poor orthodox folks do not pretend (as you seem to insinuate) to have any claim upon God by our praying,
but

but according to the Gospel-constitution, we look for the acceptance of our persons and prayers, and for everlasting salvation, only in consideration of the merits and intercession of JESUS CHRIST the one MEDIATOR. And though grateful affections are exercised, yet we cannot *allow* ourselves to think that *prayer* may therefore in *future*, be omitted, as you suggest: we, on the contrary, humbly apprehend that, since prayer has proved "so noble a mean of improving" the heart, it should still be performed in hope of further improvement this way.

After all, Sir, I do not wonder that you speak so slightly of prayer, when I recollect, that the scheme of sentiments, for which you appear so *strenuous an advocate*, does not properly *leave room* for, or *admit* of it; I mean so far as that service implies a *sense of indigence* in the petitioner, and the *seeking and expecting help* from God.

In page 41, you speak also in a diminutive way concerning the LORD'S Supper, and the account you give of the intendment thereof seems very defective; namely, "recalling to our thoughts the character of Jesus, and our obligations, as his disciples, to promote the Christian temper and practice." But the Apostle represents the case in another light, as if the LORD'S Supper was an institution to be observed in

in remembrance of CHRIST, that is, of his death, whereby was procured for us remission of sins and eternal life; for, he says, *As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death, till he come.* (k).

But of this *great event* you say not one word, though it was the very thing this institution was designed to be a solemn memorial of, and, no doubt, by the participation of the sacred elements, we are laid under obligation to live as Christians. It is true you subjoin, "that the sacrifice of CHRIST is commemorated there;" but then, by your own exposition, you manifest that you have not a *proper idea* of that term, seeing you represent it as being only a *motive* to virtue, and roundly assert "that, abstracted from its moral design, it can be of no value in the fight of God," &c,

But here I cannot agree with you, for I humbly apprehend, that the dignity of the divine person united to the human nature of CHRIST gave a proper value to his sufferings and death. And may not this sentiment be confirmed by what is said in the first chapter of the Epistle to the *Colossians*, verse 14. and following? where the efficacy of CHRIST's blood, for procuring forgiveness of sins seems to be ascribed to the relation subsisting betwixt his human na-

ture

(k) 1 Cor. xi. 26.

ture and his divine person. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins: who is the Image of the invisible GOD, the first begetter (or former) of every creature: for by him were all things created.* — And may not the same thing be inferred from what this Apostle says in his solemn charge given to the Bishops from Ephesus attending upon him at Miletus? *Feed the Church of GOD, which he hath purchased with his own blood (l).*

I readily own, that deliverance from the power and in-being of sin, is the *ultimatum* of CHRIST's redemption: for the great GOD, and our Saviour Jesus Christ, gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works (m).

Faith, as you observe, (page 42) doubtless implies “a steadfast belief of the truth of what CHRIST did and taught:” and may I not add, of what he suffered too? and of all the glorious consequences of his sufferings, both respecting himself and his people?

All orthodox Christians agree with you, in saying: “That if faith produces no amendment of character, it is good for nothing in the world.” Because, according to the Apostle James, faith, without works, is dead. But, however, that faith,

(l) Acts xx. 28. (m) Titus ii. 14.

faith, which is of the operation of God, purifies the heart, works by love, overcomes the world; and is the principle of sincere, universal, and persevering obedience. And such a faith, Sir, is certainly good for something, for though it does not *properly* save the sinner, yet it is the *appointed* *mean* of interesting the soul in the great salvation revealed and tendered in the GOSPEL.

And though we do not (as you insinuate) “found our acceptance with God upon prayer; “upon sacraments, or upon faith;” yet we humbly think, that we are instructed by the New Testament, to found our acceptance with God upon the *sufferings* and *sacrifice* of CHRIST, who has made peace through the blood of his cross; and now appears as our advocate, in the presence of God, for us. In short, we firmly believe it to be a *divine constitution*, that we should seek and look for acceptance with God unto eternal life, in and through JESUS CHRIST, who is our *Mediator* of *redemption*, and of *intercession*.

In your note, (page 43) you tells us, “that “it is no where said, that CHRIST merited salvation for himself, as being under an inviolable “obligation to do and suffer the will of God.” What? “CHRIST merit salvation for himself!” The first sight of this sentence made me *shudder*, and indeed there appears something very *shocking*,

as well as *absurd* in it. Surely, your idea of salvation must be different from that of the generality of Christian writers! With what propriety can a person be supposed to have any need of salvation, who was never in a state of sin, nor liable to misery? The Angels, who persisted in their obedience to the will of their Maker, have been thought by many grave divines to be confirmed in a state of goodness, and of happiness, but none ever intimated that they were saved. How then can this term, with any decency, be applied to the innocent, immaculate Son of God?

You declare it as a truth, "That it is no where said that CHRIST merited salvation for us." However, it is certain, that he is often represented, and spoken of as a SAVIOUR.—He is styled the SAVIOUR of the WORLD.—He came to seek and to save that which was lost.—And, it is said, *Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved. And he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.* These, and other passages of Scripture, of the same import, that might be cited, if words have any meaning at all, must imply, *that he merited Salvation for us.*

I As to the obligation of Jesus, to do and suffer the will of God, that is granted, namely, in consequence

consequence of his engagement, before all ages, which was voluntary. *No one taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again (k).*

These words evidently imply that he had a power to dispose of his own life and that it was by his own free consent, that he suffered death. *This commandment, says he, have I received of my Father.* Now, to use the words of a great Divine, (l)

“CHRIST’S receiving this commandment from
“his FATHER, is not to be considered as the
“ground of his having power to lay down his
“life, and to take it again, for this he had in
“himself, as LORD of his own life, who had an
“original right to dispose of it as he pleased,
“antecedent to the Father’s command. But
“this commandment was the reason, why he *used*
“this power in laying down his life. He did
“it in *obedience* to his Father; for he willingly
“accepted this commandment, as he delighted
“to do his Father’s will herein.”

Hence it plainly appears, that Jesus was under *no obligation* to do and suffer what he did, without his *previous consent*. And therefore, according to your own “*strict and theological sense* of the word *merit*,” he might claim a right to the favour of God for others, in consideration of what he did and suffered for them.

Whether I have set you right in this case, I know not, but, I hope, I can honestly say, that
I have

(k) John x. xviii. (l) Dr. Guyse in locum.

I have expressed myself here, as in the foregoing pages, with kindness and candour.

In note, page 44, you take notice of a book, intituled, *The Complete Duty of Man*, with a sneer. Some years ago I read that book, and acknowledge that I look upon it to be an excellent performance, well calculated to instruct the mind, assist the devotion of the heart, and to direct in the proper *regulation* of the temper and life, and your sneers and misrepresentations do not lessen my regard for it in the least, nor for the *worthy* Gentleman, the Author of it.

In the same note you do injustice to the memory of the celebrated *Calvin* by representing his system of Theology in a wrong light, in making it destroy both the *merit* and the *necessity* of good works; of which more in the sequel.

You go on to traduce the famous *Martin Luther* in the same manner. This eminent Divine was doubtless a warm advocate for the doctrine of justification by faith, without the works of the Law; and if at any time he seems to depreciate good works, I dare venture to say, from what I can learn from his writings, that he only means, that we are not to expect to be *justified* by them. In his treatise on the *Galatians*, chap. ii. ver. 16, after speaking of justification

fication by faith alone, he adds, " We grant
 " that we must teach also *good works* and *cha-*
 " *rity*, but it must be done in *time* and *place*,
 " that is to say, when the question is concern-
 " ing works, and toucheth not this article of
 " *justification*. But here the question is, By what
 " means we are justified and attain eternal life?
 " To this we answer, with *Paul*, that by faith
 " only in CHRIST, we are pronounced righteous,
 " and not by the works of the law, or charity.
 " Not because we reject good works; but that
 " we will not suffer ourselves to be removed
 " from this anchor-hold of our salvation."

And in the same tract, on chap. v. under the
 title of the doctrine of good works, he expresses
 himself thus: " It is the custom of the Apostles,
 " after they have taught faith, and instructed
 " men's consciences to add precepts of good
 " works, whereby they exhort the faithful to
 " exercise the duties of charity one towards
 " another.—To the end therefore that it might
 " appear that Christian doctrine doth not destroy
 " good works or fight against civil ordinances,
 " the Apostle also exhorteth us to exercise our-
 " selves in good works, and in an honest out-
 " ward conversation, and to keep charity and
 " concord one with another. The world can-
 " not therefore justly accuse the Christians that
 " they destroy good works, for they teach good
 " works,

“ works, and all other virtues better than all
 “ the philosophers and magistrates of the world,
 “ because they adjoin faith in their doings.”

Now by these quotations it appears that *Luther* maintained the *necessity* of good works in their *due place*. And I am very much inclined to think, that in the quotation you give from some of his writings, the term *justification* should stand in the place where you have put the word *salvation*, for that would express *Luther's* sentiment with exactness. Possibly, with the late Dr T——, you may make no distinction between justification and salvation, and so might in your translation use the last word instead of the former, as deeming them *synonymous*.

To propagate licentious doctrines I readily allow with you, “ can never do service to religion and mankind.” I abhor such an attempt as much as you may do; and I am well satisfied, the doctrine of *free grace*, as maintained by the *Calvinistical* Divines of the present age, does not enervate moral obligations, nor encourage licentious practices, and it is scurrilous in you to charge them “ with being advocates for spurious schemes of salvation, which chance, or
 “ education have thrown in their way.”

I think that I can honestly say that I have taken much pains in searching after divine truth,

and that I have received no article into my *creed* but what, after *mature* and *serious consideration*, I have found warranted by and contained in the *sacred Oracles*. And sure I am that no scripture-doctrine can be *subversive* of *moral obligations*.

Though the doctrine of grace may possibly be abused, in our day, as it was in the Apostolic age, yet the abuse of it by some not well skilled in the Gospel-scheme ought not to be charged on the scheme itself.

In p. 52, &c. and p. 45, you have given a *dreadful account* of *Calvin*, as if he had been one of the very worst of men, who struck out a *scheme* of sentiment *destructive* to *morality* in his *own* and *following* ages. But, Sir, your malevolent assertions will not pass for proofs, and especially as you have not attempted to support them as (methinks) you ought to have done by some quotations from the writings of that *mischievous Author*.

I have read the life of this great *Reformer*, written by different persons, and, so far as I remember, he is represented as a man who was *remarkably calm* in his temper. And every intelligent unprejudiced reader of his *Christian Institutes* must allow, that he was a person of *sense*, *learning*, and *judgment*. And I own, that the
main

main doctrine of that book appears to be *agreeable* to the *sacred Bible*, to which he always appealed, as the standard of truth, faith, worship, and manners. And the preface, with which it is introduced, addressed to the *French King*, contains a judicious and excellent *apology* for the Reformed, and appears to be written in a manner becoming the *gentleman*, the *loyal subject*, the *scholar*, and the *Christian*. And I appeal to all who have read this *instructive* book, whether you have not egregiously misrepresented this *worthy* man, particularly in your repeated assertions, "That he dismissed his followers from all moral obligations, or condemned all good works."

It would be tiresome to take notice of all your *uncharitable*, *imbittered*, and *envenomed* expressions concerning Calvin and his system: I rather choose, by way of contrast, to give some quotations, from his *Christian Institutes*, which, I suppose, contain the substance of his *theological* sentiments. I find him then speaking thus, "That the (moral) Law is the one perpetual and invariable rule of life (a),"

Again; "Real holiness of life may not be separated from the free imputation of righteousness: but, it is certain, that repentance

E 3

" not

(a) Institut. Lib. ii. chap. 7. § 13. Lex (moralis) una est perpetua et inflexibilis vivendi regula.

“ not only follows faith, but flows from it.—
 “ No man can embrace the grace of the Gospel,
 “ but will return from the errors of his former
 “ life into the right way, and apply his whole
 “ study to the meditation of repentance (b).

Again, “ Repentance, in my judgment, may
 “ not be ill defined thus, namely, A true con-
 “ version of our life to God, proceeding from a
 “ sincere and serious fear of him, which con-
 “ sists in the mortification of our flesh and of
 “ the old man, and in the quickening of the
 “ spirit (c).”

He says also, “ Moreover if it is true, which
 “ indeed appears with the fullest evidence, That
 “ the whole Gospel consists of these two heads,
 “ namely, repentance and remission of sins : do
 “ we not see that the L O R D therefore *freely*
 “ justifies

(b) Institut. Lib. iii, cap. 3. § 1. Neque tamen a gratuita
 justitiæ imputatione separetur realis vitæ sanctitas.—Pœnitentiam
 vero non modo fidem continuo subsequi, sed ex ea nasci,
 extra controversiam esse debet.—Evangelii gratiam nemo amplecti
 potest, quin ex erroribus vitæ prioris in rectam viam se recipiat,
 totumque suum studium applicet ad pœnitentiæ meditationem.

(c) Ibid. § 5. Quamobrem non male, meo quidem iudicio,
 sic pœnitentia definiri poterit. Esse veram ad Deum vitæ
 nostræ conversionem, a sincero serioque Dei timore profectam,
 quæ carnis nostræ veterisq; hominis mortificatione et spiritus
 vivificatione constet.

“ justifies his people ; that he, at the same time,
 “ may restore them to true righteousness by the
 “ sanctification of his spirit (d) ?”

After Calvin I might take notice that some of his followers, who have drawn up *systems* of Theology, namely, *Turretine, Piſſet, Witsius, &c. &c.* usually have these points among their common-place topicks, effectual vocation, regeneration, sanctification, penitence, and the necessity of good works in order to salvation. From whence it may justly be inferred that their *systems* befriend moral character, and indeed I find that good works are recommended in them from *better principles, on a better foundation, and in a juster manner* than by you.

Thus, Sir, according to my abilities, I have endeavoured to point out your mistakes, &c. And from what has been said, I humbly apprehend that I may warrantably conclude, That the leading title of your *Sermon* is an *absolute falshood*.

Permit me to add, that I was somewhat surprized that a Gentleman of your *critical delicacy*
 E 4 should

(d) Ibid. § 19. Porro si verum est quod clarissime constat, totam evangelii summam duobus istis capitibus contineri, penitentia et peccatorum remissione : annon videmus, Dominum ideo gratis suos justificare, quo eos simul spiritus sui sanctificatione, in veram justitiam instauret ?

should have ushered your discourse into the world, as preached before the *dissenting Clergy*, meaning, I suppose, the Ministers of that denomination, when you must know, that the New Testament does not warrant the giving that *epithet* to Teachers in the Christian Church.

The Apostle *Peter* exhorts *Presbyters* to discharge the duty of their office faithfully as those who had a real regard for the welfare of the people under their care and inspection: and he cautions them against acting as Lords over God's heritage, *τοις κληρον*, that is, the Clergy, meaning the PEOPLE or flock of GOD which they ought to feed.

Upon the whole, Sir, I would, with a spirit of friendship, humbly and earnestly recommend it to you to read your New Testament over again, and compare your own composition with it.

I heartily wish that you might retract your rash expression, "That if you be in the dark, you "are desirous of remaining so!" for the matter in debate is of *great consequence*, of the *last importance*, as our *well-being* to *eternal ages* depends upon it.

If your scheme be right I may possibly stand accepted, if I can produce a sufficient quantity
of

of virtue, when summoned to appear before the divine Tribunal; but if you are found in the wrong, then Oh Sir! how awful will the consequence be, as you renounce the scheme of mediation, and look for no favour from GOD, in consideration of what JESUS CHRIST has done and suffered, for how can you expect to stand with acceptance at the bar of Judgment? Does not the Law denounce a sentence of condemnation against every man, that yields not perfect obedience to it? and of this no man is capable in this state of imperfection. What shall we think then about this case?

The Law, as you justly observe, “justifies no transgressor.” How then, Sir, shall we be justified? Perhaps you may be ready to reply with some writers that *perfection* of obedience is not now required under the GOSPEL, but only *sincere obedience, instead of perfect*, and therefore we may expect Justification in consideration of our *sincerity*. But where do you find any scriptural warrant for reasoning in this manner? I remember that the Apostle, in *Gal. iii. 10.* speaks of the moral law as cursing every transgressor, yet (though this might have been deemed a proper place for it) he gives no hint that perfection of obedience was not required under the GOSPEL, but sincere obedience in the room of it, nay on the contrary he introduces CHRIST, as one who

who redeems believers from the curse of the law, and this is of the same import with what he declares in *Romans x. 4.* *That Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness, to every one that believeth.*

They who plead that *sincerity* is substituted under the GOSPEL in the room of *perfection*, may really shake hands with the *Antinomians*, (though they affect to be thought very different from them) for they both agree in *vacating* the obligations of the moral law, and fall equally under the *censure* of the Apostle, when he says: *Do we make void the Law through faith (f)?* Let it not be, yea, we establish the Law, namely, as an *invariable rule* of life and manners. This notion I am endeavouring to explode, appears dishonourable to the moral law, which must either be *perpetually binding*, or *cancelled*. But by the scheme of acceptance through the mediation of CHRIST the Law is *magnified* and made *honourable*.

To conclude, when we are under the shade of the schools, or even when haranguing a congregation of Christian people, we may speak coolly about the way of standing before God with acceptance. But when we place ourselves before
the

(f) *Romans iii. 31.*

the divine Tribunal, or when our consciences are affected with a sense of the evil and demerit of sin, and we are *seriously* inquiring after the way of being delivered from misery, to which sin renders us obnoxious, shall we think of deriving comfort to our souls from the consideration of *moral character*, or our *quantity* of virtue? Alas, little comfort is to be expected this way! because a conviction that our *quantity* of virtue does not *quadrature* with the *perfect* requisitions of the holy law of God, must fill us with *inward anguish*, and no ease can *rationally* be expected but by seeking the favour of God and acceptance with him, according to the constitution of the Gospel (g), which instructs us, that our persons and services are accepted only in the Beloved, *Eph. i. 6.*

And

(g) The following passage is to be met with in a Discourse concerning the Merit of good Works, printed in the year 1688, and supposed to be written by Mr *Allix*, Treasurer, of *Salisbury*.

“ But in fine, whatsoever determination was made at the
 “ Council of *Trent*, upon the Merit of good Works, I desire
 “ the Reader to consider, that there always have been a great
 “ many Christians within the Communion of the Church of
 “ *Rome* who have only apparently followed the decrees of that
 “ Council, and who, after all, have followed the doctrines
 “ of the Gospel, and of Antiquity. I say, moreover, that
 “ they have strongly opposed them, and that it was out of
 “ pure necessity that they revoked them at the hour of death.
 “ So true it is, that conscience cannot always be seduced by
 “ the errors of the understanding; and it is true also, that
 “ when

And now, dear Sir, I take my leave of you with a friendly spirit. Whether my writing has been conducted with *candour*, as well as *freedom*, must be left to you and others, to determine.

May

“ when men are approaching before the Throne of God’s
 “ Justice, it is difficult for them to preserve that spirit of pride
 “ which is in the *Roman* school. One can hardly produce a
 “ more lively proof of the truth of this reflection, than the
 “ instance of *Cardinal Hosius*, who presided at the Council
 “ of *Trent* under *Pius IV.* These are some of the expressions
 “ of his last will: *I approach the Throne of thy Grace, O Father*
 “ *of Mercies, and of all consolation, to the end that I may obtain*
 “ *mercy and find grace in thy sight. Whensoever it shall please*
 “ *thee to demand back again that which thou hast committed to*
 “ *me, into thine hands I resign my spirit, which if thou shouldest*
 “ *look upon as it is in itself, I confess it is not worthy to appear*
 “ *in the presence of thy Majesty, for it is full of all kind of*
 “ *pollution; but if thou hast respect to the blood of thy Son, where-*
 “ *in it has been washed and purified, and to those bitter tor-*
 “ *ments which he suffered for our sins, that he might render us*
 “ *acceptable in thy sight; they are worthy that, for their sake,*
 “ *thou shouldest give it eternal life, which he purchased at so*
 “ *great a Price. He desires that God would not look upon him*
 “ *in himself, but in the face of Jesus Christ. I am not worthy,*
 “ *says he, that thou shouldest behold me with the eyes of thy*
 “ *Majesty; but as it is most worthy, that for the sake of his death*
 “ *and passion, thou shouldest not only look upon me, but crown me*
 “ *also. It is therefore that I come unto thee, most dear Father,*
 “ *and that without any merits, but those inestimable ones of thy*
 “ *Son Jesus Christ, my Lord, and my Redeemer. I bring thee*
 “ *the merit of that death, wherein alone I place all my hope and*
 “ *my confidence; that is my righteousness, my satisfaction, my*
 “ *redemption, and my propitiation. The death of my Lord is my*
 “ merit

May he, with whom is the residue of the Spirit, grant unto you and me a just knowledge of God, and of J E S U S C H R I S T, even of *him* that was *crucified*, that we may look for *final acceptance*, according to the revelation of the G O S P E L !

I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your cordial Friend,

Sincere Well-wisher,

and

Most humble Servant,

Offett,
Dec. 12, 1773.

GEORGE HAGGERSTON.

" *merit.*" And after that he adds, speaking of the blood of J E S U S C H R I S T; "*Regard, O God, that price: for that price—*
"*sake declare me worthy to be placed among the sheep at thy*
"*right hand.* See here what the Conscience says when it
"*beholds its sins, and its good works; and it will never speak*
"*otherwise, especially at the hour of death, when it scatters*
"*away all illusions.*" P. 30, 31.

What he, who is the ruler of the world,
grants you and me a full knowledge of God,
and of His Christ, even of what was
before, that we may look for that day,
according to the revelation of the Gospel.

1012

412 605157521

1917-12-15

21-11-1947

1993

Meat, poultry, fish, etc.



МОТЕЛ-ГОСТИНИЦА

“And after that he said, speaking of the blood of
Jesus Christ, ‘Blessed be the Father who has
‘‘made us worthy to be partakers of the blood of his
‘‘only Son.’’ And here what the Comforter is saying
‘‘is, ‘Blessed be the Father who has made us
‘‘partakers of the blood of his only Son.’’ and it is
‘‘a blessed thing, especially at the hour of death, when it
‘‘is said, ‘Blessed be the Father who has made us
‘‘partakers of the blood of his only Son.’’”